

Guidelines have clearly reduced differences in award amounts among families and increased their levels. Nonetheless, sizable differences in award amounts among families in different states continue because of wide disparities in guidelines.<sup>12</sup> In addition, guidelines in a handful of states fall short of providing the equivalent of what two-parent families spend on their children, and in most cases fall closer to the lower than the upper bound of estimated spending on children.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, the inflation-adjusted value of the awards drops over time because few awards contain automatic cost-of-living adjustments. As a result, upward modifications of award amounts based on rising parental incomes are needed to prevent substantial erosion in purchasing power.

### Review and Modification

In response to the erosion of award amounts as prices rise, the Congress enacted requirements for periodic review and modification of awards. Moreover, modifying award levels as the incomes of noncustodial parents increase enables children to share in rises of parents' living standards. Also, should the noncustodial parent's income fall, modification provides some protection to that parent and reduces the likelihood of child support delinquencies.

Recent Legislation. In the Family Support Act, the Congress required states to put into effect review and modification procedures in two steps for families who receive services from Child Support Enforcement agencies. Beginning in October 1990, at the request of either parent or of the CSE agency, each state must review and adjust orders, subject to requirements in the state's plan. Beginning in October 1993, the state must have placed in effect a process for periodic review and adjustment of orders at intervals of 36 months or less. Those reviews need not be done, however, if (a) the state determines that for AFDC families a review would not be in the best interests of the child and neither parent has requested a review, or (b) neither parent of a non-AFDC family has requested a review.<sup>14</sup>

- 
12. Maureen A. Pirog-Good, "Child Support Guidelines and the Economic Well-Being of Our Nation's Children" (Institute for Research on Poverty, Discussion Paper no. 997-93, Madison, Wisconsin, 1993).
  13. Lewin/ICF, "Estimates of Expenditures on Children and Child Support Guidelines" (Washington, D.C., 1990).
  14. Based on the regulations, for AFDC cases with awards more than three years old, the state was to have determined whether a review was to be conducted within 15 days of October 13, 1993. For non-AFDC cases, a one-time notice was to be sent to each parent subject to a child support order in the state. The state then had 180 days (or longer if the nonrequesting parent had to be located) to complete the review and adjust the order, if appropriate.

**Effects on Child Support.** The most reliable studies of the effects of modifications on award amounts come from a series of demonstration projects in five states. In Oregon, awards for modified cases increased by an average of 59 percent.<sup>15</sup> Of those modifications, 81 percent were upward and 19 percent were downward. For the other four states--Colorado, Delaware, Florida, and Illinois--the average increase in award amounts resulting from modifications was 101 percent.<sup>16</sup> Ninety-two percent of those modifications were upward and 5 percent were downward. In the Florida and Illinois demonstrations, however, policy prevented downward modification of any cases. Thus, increases for Florida and Illinois--144 percent and 97 percent, respectively--were too high to represent current law, which requires downward as well as upward modifications. For Colorado and Delaware alone, modifications resulted in an average increase of 64 percent, a rise similar to Oregon's.

The increases in award amounts as a result of modifications to cases in those states were larger for AFDC cases than for non-AFDC cases, particularly in Colorado and Delaware, where increases averaged about 75 percent for AFDC cases and 55 percent for non-AFDC cases. Since the mid-1980s, New Jersey has had a program that raises the awards of AFDC families when the CSE agency finds that the incomes of noncustodial parents have risen significantly, resulting in increases in average awards of 135 percent.<sup>17</sup>

Not only will review and modification change award amounts, it may also alter compliance with the child support order to the extent that noncustodial parents would have to pay more or less child support. Evidence from the Oregon and four-state demonstrations is conflicting. The Oregon study found that compliance rates declined from 78 percent to 68 percent for noncustodial parents whose child support awards were increased; they rose from 37 percent to 48 percent for those whose awards decreased.<sup>18</sup> In the four-state demonstration, compliance rates remained about the same, although that study looked at a shorter period following modification for some families than did the Oregon study.<sup>19</sup>

---

15. Policy Studies Inc., "Oregon Child Support Updating Project: Final Report" (Denver, Colorado, 1991).

16. Caliber Associates, "Evaluation of Child Support Review and Modification Demonstration Projects in Four States: Cross-Site Final Report" (1992).

17. New Jersey Child Support Enforcement Services, Administrative Office of the Courts, *New Jersey Child Support Guidelines: 1987 Year Evaluation* (Trenton, New Jersey: Office of the Courts, 1987).

18. Robert G. Williams, "Implementation of the Child Support Provisions of the Family Support Act: Child Support Guidelines, Updating of Awards, and Routine Income Withholding" (paper presented at A Conference on Child Support and Child Well Being, Airlie, Virginia, 1991).

19. Caliber Associates, "Evaluation."

Use. The effects on award amounts were dramatic in cases for which awards were actually modified. Few cases were, however. In Oregon, only about 16 percent of all cases--22 percent of AFDC cases and 8 percent of non-AFDC cases--potentially eligible for review were modified.<sup>20</sup> In the other four states, about 13 percent (19 percent of AFDC cases and 10 percent of non-AFDC cases) were modified.<sup>21</sup>

Why were so few cases modified? In the four states--Colorado, Delaware, Florida, and Illinois--67 percent of all potential case reviews were closed before any review. In those states, the primary reasons for closing reviews of AFDC cases were: "inappropriate for review" (for example, no enforceable order in the state, the case had been closed, and so forth); "no authorization" or "no response"; "insufficient information" (for example, no information on the income of an obligor was available); and inability to locate the obligor or obligee. In non-AFDC cases, 45 percent of reviews were terminated because authorities failed to get a response to a review notice or lacked authorization for a review. Those non-AFDC families indicated a number of reasons that they would not authorize a review--namely, they did not want to go to court; they were not currently receiving child support payments; they were concerned that the award might be reduced; and they believed that the noncustodial parent was paying all that he or she could afford. In Oregon as well, few non-AFDC families--only 16 percent of those eligible--authorized a review.

### Immediate Wage Withholding

Withholding child support payments from a noncustodial parent's wages is seen as one of the most effective means of improving compliance with child support orders. As noted earlier, only one-half of women awarded child support receive all of it that is due them over a year's time, and that proportion remained constant during the 1980s.

Recent Legislation. The Congress has taken several steps to require wage withholding in child support cases. In 1984, the Child Support Enforcement Amendments required states to impose wage withholding in IV-D (CSE) cases when payments in arrears amounted to one month's child support. Withholding could be imposed earlier if desired by the state or requested by the noncustodial parent. That provision for delinquency withholding continues to apply to orders not subject to immediate wage withholding. In addition, the amendments directed that all child

---

20. Policy Studies Inc., "Oregon Updating Child Support Project." These estimates were adjusted on the basis of information from the Caliber Associates study of the disposition of pending cases after the second year of the Oregon project.

21. Caliber Associates, "Evaluation." These estimates were also raised to account for pending cases, on the basis of the Oregon numbers.

support orders issued or modified in a state were to include an order for wage withholding, thus permitting withholding without further action by the court or other agency. At state option, withholding could be applied to income other than earnings and could be immediate.

The Family Support Act then required immediate wage withholding for all IV-D orders issued or modified, beginning November 1990, unless the court found good cause not to or both parties agreed to an alternative arrangement in writing. Beginning January 1994, the act further required states to carry out immediate wage withholding for all child support orders issued, regardless of IV-D status, subject to the same exceptions as above.

**Effects on Child Support.** A number of analysts using econometric techniques have measured the effect of immediate wage withholding on child support payments. Their results differ greatly. Moreover, most of the studies are limited geographically and none are entirely persuasive. The most reliable results come from several studies that use data from a demonstration project in Wisconsin, in which families with and without immediate withholding could be identified directly.<sup>22</sup> Unfortunately, Wisconsin is not necessarily representative because its child support system is better than many.<sup>23</sup>

In its projections to 1995, CBO used the most recent study based on the Wisconsin data to measure the effect of immediate withholding on child support payments.<sup>24</sup> The study compared cases in which a withholding order was issued at the time of the first child support award with all other cases, including those with delinquency withholding, thus approximating the effects of the Family Support Act requirements.<sup>25</sup> It measured effects on four separate child support variables,

- 
22. The Wisconsin demonstration included pilot counties that put immediate income withholding into effect and control counties that employed some income withholding after delinquency and increasing use of immediate withholding as the demonstration progressed. At the beginning of the demonstration, the pilot counties used immediate withholding in 57 percent of the cases and the control counties used it in 20 percent; by the end of the demonstration, the pilot counties were using immediate withholding in 65 percent of the cases and the control counties were using it in 53 percent. Thus, it is important that the dependent variable in any analysis be individual cases with or without immediate withholding, rather than county use or a related variant.
  23. For example, on the basis of a number of child support indicators in fiscal year 1989, Wisconsin was ranked 16th among states. See House Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Human Resources, *Child Support Enforcement Report Card* (1991), p. 14.
  24. Findings from other studies are summarized in Appendix C.
  25. Daniel R. Meyer and Judi Bartfeld, "The Effects of the Immediate Withholding of Child Support on Collections Over Time" (Institute for Research on Poverty, Final Report for Wisconsin Department of Health and Social Services, Madison, Wisconsin, 1992). By using a withholding order issued at the time of the award as a measure of immediate withholding rather than a measure of continued

including the probability of a child support payment and the probability of full payment. The authors found that immediate withholding had a statistically significant effect on all of the dependent variables, but that the effect declined during the three years after the award.<sup>26</sup> By the third year after the award, the study's researchers estimated that immediate withholding increased the probability of any child support payment by 8 percentage points and the probability of full payment by 4 percentage points.

**Use.** In how many child support cases is immediate withholding likely to be used? Evidence in a few selected areas points to great variation in use, depending on such factors as the noncustodial parent's income type and the length of time since the withholding order.

A recent study based on the Wisconsin demonstration project found that immediate withholding was ordered at the time the award was established in 84 percent of paternity cases and in 82 percent of divorce cases.<sup>27</sup> Its use varied by the noncustodial parent's type of income (about 90 percent use for cases involving wage or salary income as compared with 40 percent for cases involving self-employment income) and by county even after controlling for county differences (ranging from use of less than two-thirds to 100 percent), among other factors.

Another study, which surveyed 30 local IV-D offices, corroborated the Wisconsin finding that it is more difficult to put withholding into effect when the noncustodial parent is self-employed or has nonwage income.<sup>28</sup> Among all of the child support offices surveyed--those with only delinquency withholding as well as those with immediate withholding--28 percent were never successful in initiating

---

withholding or withholding actually carried out, the study may understate the effects of immediate withholding.

26. The authors suggested two reasons that immediate wage withholding effects might change over time. First, they might increase if withholding kept noncustodial parents from becoming delinquent as time passed. Second, they might decrease if job turnover led to a loss of withholding, particularly if noncustodial parents changed jobs more frequently in order to avoid the withholding.
27. Daniel R. Meyer and Judi Bartfeld, "How Routine Is 'Routine' Withholding? Evidence from Wisconsin" (Institute for Research on Poverty, final report for the Wisconsin Department of Health and Social Services, Madison, Wisconsin, 1992). These estimates probably overstate the use of immediate withholding because they measure use by the existence of a withholding order at the time the order was established. Some cases, however, may never have withholding actually implemented. In addition, interstate cases, for which withholding is more difficult, were excluded from the sample.
28. Anne R. Gordon, "Income Withholding, Medical Support, and Services to Non-AFDC Cases After the Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1984" (Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., Princeton, New Jersey and Policy Studies Inc., Denver, Colorado, 1991). The study obtained data from 30 local IV-D offices in 11 states; 11 of those offices in four states were required by state law to use immediate withholding in 1989.

income withholding for self-employed noncustodial parents for whom it was required, and another 62 percent were successful in one-fifth or fewer of the cases. Most of the offices reported success in only one-fifth of the cases involving nonwage income.

Even for noncustodial parents with wage and salary income, income withholding is not easy. Employers as well as noncustodial parents must sometimes be located, and doing so is not always simple in the face of job turnover.<sup>29</sup> The 30-office study reported that in jurisdictions that required immediate withholding, 88 percent of the cases included withholding in their order. But withholding had been attempted or was in place in the past year in only 65 percent of all cases. In 59 percent of cases withholding was actually imposed in the past year, and in 46 percent withholding was current.<sup>30</sup> Withholding rates in the past year increased from 59 percent to 79 percent for cases in which both wage records and IV-D case files indicated that the obligors were employed.

Withholding in any child support case can be expected to decline over time as a noncustodial parent loses a job, changes a job, or cannot be located. The evidence bears that presumption out. In about one-third of all cases in the 30-office study, withholding periods ended in six months or less. In almost one-half of all cases, however, withholding periods lasted more than two years. In Oregon's demonstration of review and modification, discussed earlier, 45 percent of income-withholding actions were no longer in effect one year after they were started in conjunction with modifications of child support orders.<sup>31</sup> In cases involving immediate withholding, however, the durations of the withholding actions should lengthen.

### Paternity Establishment

Legislators and child support administrators have given a high priority to improving establishments of paternity. Not only has the IV-D system performed poorly in establishing paternities, but many people believe that it is important for children to know, and be supported by, both parents. In recent years, the Congress has enacted

---

29. A number of states now require that employers report new hires and rehires to the child support agency. Such programs should make wage withholding more effective.

30. The 30-office study also identified the reasons that withholding was not attempted or initiated. For cases subject to immediate withholding, the obligor was not found (12 percent of cases), the obligor was not employed (20 percent), the obligor was in jail (5 percent), or the reason was indeterminate (58 percent).

31. Robert G. Williams, "Implementation."

a number of provisions boosting the establishment of paternity, including the setting of performance standards, expedited processes, and requiring that states use specific procedures.

**Recent Legislation.** In the Family Support Act, the Congress mandated that states meet a performance standard for fiscal years beginning on or after October 1, 1991.<sup>32</sup> The standard is based on a paternity-establishment ratio--namely, the number of children in the state born out of wedlock (who receive AFDC benefits or IV-D services) for whom a paternity has been established divided by the total number of such children. The standard requires that a state's ratio (a) be at least 50 percent, (b) be equal at least to the average for all states, or (c) have increased by 3 percentage points from fiscal year 1988 to 1991, and by 3 percentage points each year thereafter. Because some states could not calculate the ratio reliably, the Office of Child Support Enforcement has not recently enforced the performance standards.

The act, and the final rules carrying out the act's provisions, also applied standards for the way in which programs operate to establish paternity. The agency must file for paternity establishment, complete service of process to establish paternity, or document unsuccessful attempts to serve process within 90 days of locating the alleged father.<sup>33</sup> Then the agency must establish paternity or exclude the alleged father as a result of genetic testing or legal process within a year of successful service of process or the child reaching six months of age, whichever is later.<sup>34</sup> The act also mandated that states require parents to furnish their Social Security numbers in conjunction with actions pertaining to birth certificates and require all parties to submit to genetic tests at the request of any party, effective November 1990 and November 1989, respectively. The federal matching rate for laboratory costs incurred in determining paternity was increased to 90 percent, beginning October 1988.

OBRA-93 tightened the performance standards, effective for fiscal years beginning October 1, 1994. The new standards require that the ratio of paternity establishment be at least 75 percent, or increase by 3 percentage points a year (beginning with fiscal year 1995 compared with 1994) for a state with a ratio between 50 percent and 75 percent, and increase incrementally by up to 6 percentage points a year for states with ratios below 40 percent. The act also directed states to

- 
32. If a state fails to meet the performance standard, it can lose a portion of its federal AFDC funds, but only if it does not take corrective action.
33. Service of process signifies that the alleged father has had delivered to him, or left with him, the legal documents in question.
34. These standards would be superseded by new timeframes for expedited processes under proposed rules carrying out OBRA-93.

enact laws requiring the use of such procedures as a "simple" civil process for voluntarily acknowledging paternity (including an in-hospital program); voluntary acknowledgments as evidence of paternity; genetic testing results to create a rebuttable or, at state option, a conclusive presumption of paternity; and entering orders that establish paternity by default.<sup>35</sup> Further, states had to meet rules for "expedited processes" based on specified time frames for various paternity actions. That provision, and the procedure requirements, were effective October 1993, or later if states had to change their laws.<sup>36</sup>

**Effects on Child Support.** There are no studies indicating the full effects of those legislative changes. The effects of requiring states to meet standards for establishing paternity, in particular, are not known. However, a few studies shed light on the impacts of various procedures that could improve the establishment of paternities.

Several studies of paternity establishments for unmarried fathers in hospitals are available. Only one, however, measures effects. In Denver, a demonstration of procedures encouraging voluntary acknowledgments of paternity in hospitals after the birth of a child found that the rate of acknowledgements increased from 22 percent to 35 percent in one hospital and from 12 percent to 24 percent in a second hospital.<sup>37</sup> A IV-D case was opened in only one-third of those establishments. Thus, most mothers had probably not pursued child support awards and also most likely a minority were AFDC mothers. In general, the largest increases in voluntary acknowledgments were among women over 20 years of age, who had worked during their pregnancy and who had at least a high school education.

In the state of Washington, which has had a paternity acknowledgment program operating in hospitals since 1989, more than 40 percent of fathers signed a paternity affidavit in hospitals in 1992.<sup>38</sup> Fewer than one-third of the affidavits were matched with IV-D cases, however. Early results from a new statewide program in

---

35. For example, if the alleged father fails to respond to a service of process, paternity may be established by default.

36. By regulation, in-hospital paternity establishment programs had to be statewide by January 1, 1995.

37. Jessica Pearson and Nancy Thoennes, "The Denver Child Support Improvement Project: Paternity Establishment. Preliminary Results" (Center for Policy Research, Denver, Colorado, 1993). This study's findings probably overstate the final impacts because some establishments would occur at a later date.

38. Washington Department of Social and Health Services, various memoranda on the Washington in-hospital program for paternity acknowledgment, January 1993 and earlier.



Massachusetts showed a 53 percent acknowledgement rate.<sup>39</sup> A program in West Virginia obtained paternity acknowledgments in 40 percent of births; 46 percent of those children for whom paternity was acknowledged were receiving AFDC or Medicaid. Another program in a single hospital in Kent County, Michigan, had an acknowledgment rate of 46 percent.<sup>40</sup>

A voluntary acknowledgment does not necessarily end the process of establishing paternity, as shown by Washington state's tracking of IV-D cases following the in-hospital acknowledgment. For 80 percent of those cases, the state successfully served notices to the presumed fathers. When served, the fathers defaulted--that is, they acknowledged paternity or never contacted the CSE agency after receiving a notice of parental responsibility--in 78 percent of the cases, the CSE agency agreed to a settlement or a judge approved a consent order in 14 percent, and the fathers requested genetic testing to prove paternity in fewer than 3 percent. One-half of the remaining cases were still in process.

After establishing paternity, the next step is securing a child support award. Voluntary establishments of paternity in hospitals can affect the number of awards in two ways: by establishing more paternities and by speeding up the process of paternity establishment, thus increasing the probability of locating the father and securing an award. It took only two weeks to get the father's name on the birth certificate in the Denver demonstration, compared with more than five months for voluntary paternity acknowledgments under predemonstration procedures and with about two years for court-ordered establishments. In Washington the procedures were also speedy, taking a median of a little over three months to secure a final support order.

Other procedures designed to raise paternity establishments were tested in Cuyahoga County, Ohio and Douglas County, Nebraska but results were not particularly encouraging. Cuyahoga County conducted a demonstration to test selected procedures for expediting and streamlining paternity establishments, including the increased use of voluntary acknowledgments.<sup>41</sup> The expedited procedures increased voluntary establishments by a statistically significant 5 percentage points but decreased contested establishments. As a result, total

---

39. Jane C. Venohr and Robert G. Williams, "Quarterly Report: Baseline Data and Program Results, October 18, 1994" (Policy Studies Inc., Denver, Colorado, 1994).

40. Barbara C. Cleveland and Andrew M. Williams, *Paternity Establishment: State Innovations* (Office of Child Support Enforcement, 1992).

41. Charles F. Adams, Jr., David Landsbergen, and Larry Cobler, "Welfare Reform and Paternity Establishment: A Social Experiment," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, vol. 11, no. 4 (1992), pp. 665-687.

establishments rose by about 4 percentage points--a statistically insignificant increase--from a level of only 15 percent. Those procedures also reduced considerably the time it took to secure establishment of paternity. It is interesting to note that the average age of the children for whom paternity was not established was over five years, perhaps helping to explain why so few paternities were established.

Douglas County, Nebraska evaluated a number of procedures, including using a specialized team of workers for establishing paternity, conducting educational seminars for unwed mothers, contacting the alleged fathers in person, taking action before the child's birth or at the time of application for AFDC, and using private process servers.<sup>42</sup> Taken together, all of these procedures increased the rate of paternity establishment from 7.9 percent to 8.2 percent, a difference that was not statistically significant. Because of serious problems putting the program into effect in the first year, followed by greatly improved performance in the second year of the two-year demonstration, the true long-term effects of the procedures are difficult to assess.

Another study, based on econometric techniques, suggested that certain practices associated with establishing paternity, including several related to the mandates of OBRA-93, may have positive results.<sup>43</sup> Allowing fathers to agree to genetic tests without challenging the results (if a predetermined probability of paternity was indicated) was associated with an increase in the paternity establishment ratio of 20 percentage points. An increase of 37 percentage points in the ratio was associated with combining a multiple consent process with a "two-agency transfer process," in which the human services agencies handle uncontested cases and transfer only contested cases to legal agencies. A 10 percentage point rise in the ratio was associated with issuing a default judgment when a father failed to respond to his first notice, but that finding was not statistically significant.<sup>44</sup> Findings from this study are considerably larger than from the Ohio and Nebraska demonstrations. The specific procedures being evaluated differed and results from econometric studies are often uncertain.

- 
42. David A. Price and Victoria S. Williams, "Nebraska Paternity Project. Final Report" (Policy Studies Inc., Denver, Colorado, 1990). For legal and other reasons, the county had problems carrying out the latter three of these procedures.
43. Freya L. Sonenstein, Pamela A. Holcomb, and Kristin S. Seefeldt, "What Works Best in Improving Paternity Rates?," *Public Welfare* (Fall 1993), pp. 26-43. The 1990 National Survey of Paternity Establishment Procedures collected information that was representative of counties in the contiguous United States.
44. The paternity establishment ratio was measured as the number of paternities established in each county in fiscal year 1989 divided by the number of out-of-wedlock births in the county in calendar year 1988. Caution is required in using associations to indicate causality. Although use of those specified procedures might raise states' paternity establishment ratios, it is also possible that states with high ratios for a number of other reasons might coincidentally be using those procedures.

The establishment of paternity does not necessarily affect child support outcomes. Before that can happen, child support awards must be secured. The evidence indicates that awards are secured in a high proportion of the IV-D cases once paternity is established--probably around 80 percent. For example, in Wisconsin, 78 percent of never-married women with paternity established had awards and in Arizona (Mariposa and Pima counties), 80 percent had awards.<sup>45</sup> In the Nebraska demonstration, 90 percent of the mothers who had paternity established had support orders; when they did not have orders, it was usually because the father was in the household.<sup>46</sup>

### Effects on Child Support Collections

Based on its projections using the TRIM2 model, CBO estimated that the four important legislative changes--paternity establishment, guidelines, review and modification, and immediate wage withholding--taken together would increase the total amount of child support due in 1995 by \$2.5 billion, or just under 12 percent. The total amount of child support received was expected to increase by \$1.7 billion, or just over 12 percent. Those legislative effects will continue to increase beyond 1995 as the number of mothers with new or modified awards increases.

Three of the four legislative changes--paternity establishment, guidelines, and review and modification--directly affect awards, so that the large increase in award amounts is not surprising. Only immediate wage withholding affects child support receipts directly without first changing awards. As a result, the ratio of child support amounts received to amounts due was estimated to increase by only 1 percentage point.

The largest improvements in collections were estimated to come from legislation pertaining to guidelines and review and modification: a \$1.9 billion, or 9 percent, increase in amounts of child support due, which also raises child support received by 8 percent (see Table 6). Improvements in establishing paternity result in an estimated \$0.6 billion, or 3 percent, rise in award amounts, and to a smaller

---

45. Sandra K. Danziger and Ann Nichols-Casebolt, "Teen Parents and Child Support: Eligibility, Participation, and Payment," *Journal of Social Service Research*, vol. 11, no. 2/3 (1987/88) and Ann Nichols-Casebolt, "Who Has Paternity Established? An Analysis of Characteristics Related to the Successful Establishment of Paternity" (paper presented at the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management conference, Denver, Colorado, October, 1992).

46. David A. Price and Victoria S. Williams, "Nebraska Paternity Project."

---

**TABLE 6. ESTIMATED EFFECTS OF LEGISLATIVE CHANGES ON CHILD SUPPORT AMOUNTS DUE AND COLLECTED, 1995 (In billions of dollars)**

---

Legislative Change	Total Child Support Due	Total Child Support Collected
Paternity Establishment	0.6	0.4
Guidelines and Review and Modification	1.9	1.1
Immediate Wage Withholding	<u>0</u>	<u>0.2</u>
Total	2.5	1.7

---

**SOURCE:** Congressional Budget Office based on estimates from TRIM2 microsimulation model.

**NOTES:** Changes are based on Congressional Budget Office estimates of legislative effects, which are then simulated in the TRIM2 model.

The effects for each legislative change depend on the ordering of the simulations, which was as shown in the table.

---

increase in child support received.<sup>47</sup> Immediate wage withholding has no effect on awards and was estimated to raise child support received by \$0.2 billion, or less than 2 percent.

---

47. The estimated increments in child support amounts for any single legislative change depend on the order in which the effects were simulated. For example, improving paternity establishment was simulated first, before award amounts were raised by guidelines and review and modification. Had its effects been simulated afterward, they would have been larger. Conversely, had the effects of guidelines and review and modification been simulated before improvements in establishing paternity, their estimated effects would have been smaller (see Table 6).